REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

In the Office Action dated April 06, 2006, claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama (US–2003/0030382, hereinafter "Koyama") in view of Kane (US – 6,229,508, hereinafter "Kane").

After traversing the rejections, claims 1-2 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama (US – 2003/0030382, hereinafter "Koyama") in view of Kane (US – 6,229,508, hereinafter "Kane").

Applicant traverses the rejection for reasons discussed below.

Rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for claims 1 and 2 over Koyama in view of Kane are traversed based upon the following:

Koyama in view of Kane has failed to teach the following claim limitation in claim 1: "in an **initial stage** of the turning on of the charging path used by the current source to charge the capacitor of the AMOLED pixel, providing **a pre-charging signal** to the current source to have the capacitor discharged". The above claim limitation is fully supported **and defined** in the **full context** in FIG. 4 and paragraphs [0019] and [0020] in which the start of the Scan-on (a scanning control signal of a scanning line) and the Pre-

Charge are provided in an **initial stage** of the turning on of the charging path used by the current source, and the duration of the Pre-Charge is **within that of the Scan-on**. However, none of FIGs. 4, 6, 8, and 11 in Kane teach the above limitation recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Examiner has admitted that the above limitation is not disclosed in Koyama in page 3 of the Office action.

The "pre-charging" in Kane and the "pre-charging" in the present invention are **distinctly different**. Since "pre-charging" is not a term that possesses a precise ordinary meaning, the exact definitions of "pre-charging" and "pre-charging signal" for Kane and the present invention, respectively, have to be determined by referring to the entire content of the descriptions. In fact, Kane teaches using a *separate* autozero line 380, 580, 780 parallel to the select line 370, 570, 770 to perform the precharge function as shown in FIGs. 3, 5, and 7. In contrast, the present invention teaches using a scanning control signal applied through a conventional scanning line to achieve the pre-charging, as described in paragraphs [0019] and [0020] (without a separate line such as the "autozero line" of Kane). Thus, the limitation, "in response to a scanning control signal," associated with the "**pre-charging signal**" explicitly recited in the amended claim 1 patently distinguishes from either Koyama or Kane, or both in combination. As a result, claim 1 should be allowed.

Moreover, Koyama in view of Kane also fails to teach the following limitation recited in claim 2: "the pre-charging signal makes the capacitor to discharge to a pre-

determined potential value," because there is no signal, such as the pre-charging signal, disclosed in either reference.

As admitted by the Examiner in page 3 of the Office action, Kane teaches the following: "...then Data is written to the pixel of the previous row, which would then cause the capacitor to discharge..." Thus, the above is interpreted to mean the following: Data written to the pixel of the previous row **causes** the capacitor to discharge.

As a result, no teachings are found in Kane explicitly or inherently for a **pre-charging signal** making or "causing" the capacitor to discharge to a pre-determined potential value, as required by claim 2.

Therefore, the above claim limitation in claim 2 is patentable over Koyama in view of Kane. Furthermore, pending the allowance of independent claim 1, dependent claim 2 should also be allowed.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/604,818
Docket No.: 11260-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-2 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : June 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee
Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw